DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 379 RC 009 652

AUTHOR Nicholson, Beryl
TITLE Local Migration as a Component of Rural Population Change. An Example from North Norway.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Rural Sociology (4th, Torun, Poland, August 1976) ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; *Community Size; Demography; Foreign Countries; *Migration; *Population Distribution; Population Trends; Relocation; *Rural Population; *Rural to Urban Migration
IDENTIFIERS *Norway; World Congress of Rural Sociology (4th)

ABSTRACT

Migration over a period of 20 years in 3 neighbouring, but contrasting, communes in North Norway was examined to determine whether a village or small town in a rural area functioned as an intervening opportunity for the area's rural inhabitants. The nature and effects of local migration which occurred in a predominantly rural area during the period in which the development of urban settlements at the lowest urban hierarchy level was taking place, but in which there was no policy intended specifically to influence the settlement pattern, were examined. The communes differed topographically and in the number and size of agglomerated settlements. Data were obtained from: each commune's population register, migration notifications during the period 1962 to mid-1965, and published and unpublished census data. Population registers consisted of a card index containing address changes and new addresses of the members of each household. Skjervoy was used as a trial growth centre. Findings included: between 40% and 50% of the migrants were between 15 and 24 years of age; migrants to growing villages were more evenly distributed over the age range than migrants to other places; single people were less prone to move locally than families; and an important element in the growth of villages and small towns in rural areas was immigration from other areas. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED134379

RC009652

Fourth World Congress of Rural Sociology

Torun, Poland, 9-13 August 1976

4 V

Local migration as a component of rural population change. An example from North Norway.

Beryl Nicholson
12, Lavender Gardens,
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 3DE,
England.

Since Ravenstein published his paper on the Laws of Migration in 1885, it has been widely assumed that small towns gain population from their immediate hinterlands, and send, in turn, migrants to the larger town in whose hinterland they are located (Ravenstein, 1885, p.199). The development of central place theory further encouraged the acceptance of an analogous concept of urbanisation, which assumes a succession of migratory movements which correspond to levels of an urban hierachy. "There exists ..... a phenomenon of rural exodus even at commune level, characterised by a drift of population from the purely agricultural hamlets towards the administrative centre ..... it is like a replica in miniature of the movement within the département towards Poitiers and within France as a whole (Pitie, 1957, p.496, author's translation). As in central place theory, the migration fields at successively higher levels of the urban hierachy become successively greater. If this is the case, then settlements at the lowest levels of the urban hierachy will gain migrants predominantly from their immediate vicinity.

In Norway urbanisation began later than in many other parts of western Europe, but it has proceeded quite rapidly in this century. Proportionally, though not in absolute terms, the greatest growth in recent decades has been at the lower levels of the urban hierachy, and this has been considered as constituting the completion of the system of central places in areas where it was previously weakly developed (Myklebost, 1974, p.146).

It is hardly surprising therefore, that the movements underlying this development are widely accepted as following a hierachical pattern. Migration is assumed to consist of two main types of movement:
"a) a concentration to small and medium-sized urban settlements and central places where the commune or district comprises the most important migration field..... .
"b) a concentration to the larger urban regions where a region or the whole country is the migration field" (Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet, 1967, p.8, author's translation). A few years later, in a policy document on a regional plan for North Norway, it was stated that "Most of the considerable migratory movements in the post-war period have taken place within the region, from areas of dispersed settlement to local villages, which in turn have a net migration loss to regional centres and large towns" (Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet, 1973, p.14, author's translation).

Policies for promoting the growth of existing small central places have been justified on the grounds that movements of this kind were already taking place where central places existed, and that therefore villages and small towns constituted an intervening opportunity for migrants. Such places made it possible to move from rural areas to the better

employment possibilities and service provision of a small town without having to move to an unknown area, and this was felt to be desirable. Thus, in the proposed regional plan for North Norway, the idea of the creation of "base areas" was put forward. These were "to be regarded as areas of in-migration where people from the remotest areas can find a new and satisfying existence and where highly educated people, irrespective of where they are from in the country, can find challenge and contentment" (Miljöverndepartementet, 1972, p.20, author's translation). It is clear from the remainder of the text that it is the first objective which is considered the more important. Not least, such places are to function as alternative to the major towns as migration destinations (Myklebost, 1974, p.149). Similar proposals have been put forward in a number of countries experiencing high levels of migration from the countryside which goes predominantly to the largest cities.

However, policies of creating new urban settlements, or promoting the growth of existing ones, have also been initiated with quite different aims. The British new towns and expanded towns provide an example. Here the aim was generally to attract people from existing large cities and conurbations, possibly at some distance from the new or expanded town. Thus in a study of in-migration to a new town in a rural area with a declining population, Newtown in Mid-Wales, an opinion was expressed which was the complete opposite of that widely held in Norway, "Movement from relatively distant locations is clearly the desirable form of in-migration". The reason for this is that "it helps to swell the local labour force without at the same time withdrawing labour from other demographically vulnerable parts of Mid-Wales". And there was indeed a considerable degree of success in attracting in-migrants from places some distance away (Jones, 1974, p.21).

In the light of these conflicting views, it is pertinent to ask whether a village or small town in a rural area does indeed function as an intervening opportunity for the area's rural inhabitants. Recruitment of migrants to Newtown from a wide area might have been due to the promotional activity associated with the establishment of new towns, therefore the findings in that particular case do not necessarily invalidate the assumptions underlying Norwegian policy.

Existing evidence of migration from rural areas to the local central place is sparse and the conclusions which can be drawn from it are limited by the nature of the available data. Several writers have followed Ravenstein and used birthplace data (e.g. Harvey and Riddell (1975) in Sierra Leone). However, this shows only where an individual lives at an arbitrary point in time, as compared with his or her birthplace, and tells nothing about the nature of moves in the intervening period. Data from migration registration, in countries where this is obligatory, is generally limited to administrative units too large to allow purely local movement to be included. Probably the best data of this type is the Swedish data at parish level; there are commonly several parishes within a commune. With this data Hägerstrand showed that within a predominantly rural commune in south-west Sweden there was indeed a tendency to move within it to the two station villages from the other areas. However this local movement was exceeded by net loss due to migration to other communes from all the parishes, and even in areas with a net internal gain, this gain was not sufficient to compensate for the total migration loss (Hägerstrand, 1957, pp.67,68).

In Norway, where migration registrations are limited to movements between communes, assumptions about local movement have been derived from observed changes in population distribution. Within communes agglomerated settlements have grown, while areas of dispersed settlement

have, on the whole, experienced a fall in population. This has been taken to reflect a movement from the latter to the former (see e.g. Berg, 1965, p.106). The one source of data on migration not limited to movements over commune boundaries, the (unpublished) records of government assisted migration from exposed coastal areas, shows that movements under this scheme took place for the most part within communes. However the numbers involved are so small, only about 630 households in twenty years (Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet, 1973, p.48) compared with over 150,000 registered migrants per year during the same year, and their circumstances are so atypical, that this evidence cannot be taken as an indication of a more general tendency to move within communes.

The area studied

To test the assumptions about local movement, migration over a period of twenty years in three neighbouring, but contrasting, communes in North Norway was examined. At the beginning of the period this part of the country was among those with the lowest levels of urban population. It could therefore be considered as an example of an area where one might expect a central place network to be still developing. Of the four settlements classified as agglomerations for census purposes[1] by 1970, only one would have qualified in 1920, two more by 1946 and the fourth only fulfilled the requirements in 1970 (Myklebost, 1960, p.327 and Central Bureau of Statistics, 1973,p.22). Three of the settlements, all of which had some central place functions, had approximately doubled in size over the twenty year period studied. The fourth, which is an isolated, but thriving, fishing settlement, increased in size by 50%. The total population of the area was almost the same at the end as at the beginning of the period, having risen until the mid-1950's, then slowly declined. However it is clear from the growth of certain settlements that a redistribution of population has taken place, and the area is therefore one in which migration from the rural areas to the villages might be expected.

The three communes[2] differ topographically and also, more importantly for the purpose of the present paper, in the number and size of agglomerated settlements. In one of the communes, Kvænangen, which lies round the fjord of the same name, none of the settlements is large enough to be classified as an agglomeration. In Nordreisa, which consists of a valley and a small fjord at the mouth of it, there are two villages, 5 km. apart, which in 1965, when the data for this study were collected, had populations of about 350The largest settlement in the area is the administrative centre of the commune of Skjervöy, which has the same name as the commune, and will therefore be referred to henceforth as the place Skjervöy. The commune consists of three rural separate areas on the mainland, which contain a little over half of the population, and a number of islands. The place Skjervöy, which had a population of almost 1400 in 1965, is located on one of the islands. The other agglomerated settlement in the commune, Årviksand, with apopulation of 320 in 1965, has an isolated location on another island, facing the Arctic Ocean. The rural settlement of the area extends along the coasts of both mainland and islands and along valleys, though it is restricted to the narrow strips of land which lie below the 100 meter contour. As the median size of agricultural holdings is only about 20 dekar, settlement is fairly dense compared with many other rural areas in Europe. However, due to the linear nature of the settled area and the separation of the individual parts from one another by mountains and sea, distances between different parts of the area are relatively great. An indication of the size of the area can be gained from the fact that the section of the North Norway highway which traverses it from east to west is 150 km. long.

The data source

For this area it was found possible to obtain data on local migration, that is within communes, from the population register of each commune. The population register consists of a card index containing information about the members of each household. Changes of address have to be notified and new addresses are recorded on the cards. The data used in this study were obtained by comparing current addresses at the time of data collection (August 1965) with those which had been crossed out. The registers used were set up in January 1946, therefore the data cover moves made over a period of almost twenty years. Some loss of data is inevitable as, for the purposes of the register, old addresses are obsolescent information. Reasons for loss include migration out of the commune, death, or simply replacement of cards which wear out. The loss is estimated to be between 10% and 20%, therefore over 80% of the moves which were made within these three communes over a twenty year period are included. To avoid problems of definition of the length of move which could be classified as migration, the study has been restricted to moves which involved crossing the boundary of an electoral district (E.D., Norwegian: tellingskrets). Use has also been made of migration notifications during the period 1962 to mid-1965 and of published and unpublished census data.

While the data were being collected the place Skjervöy was designated a trial growth centre. A follow-up study of the period after 1965 would therefore have provided the basis for a useful comparison of periods of spontaneous and promoted growth. However a request for access to the data source some years after the original data were collected was unsuccessful. The opportunity of monitoring the effects of the promotion of urban growth was therefor lost. What this study shows, therefore, is the nature and effects of such local migration as took place in a predominantly rural area during the period in which the development of urban settlements at the lowest levels of the urban hierachy was taking place, but in which there was no policy intended specifically to influence the pattern of settlement.

The scale of local migration

If the assumptions about the importance of local migration are correct, then the volume of movements within a commune will be comparable with, or even greater than movements to and from each commune. Table 1 shows that in these three communes at least, the assumption is not borne out.

Table 1. Number of migrants in relation to the resident population 1965.

	Local migrants abs.	Local migrants %	Out-migrants 1951-64	In-migrants 1951-64	Resident population 1965 abs.
Kvænangen	129	5.6	54.5	29.4	2295
Nordreisa total	135	5.4	61.5	38.3	2523
Storslett 1)	51	7.9			642
Sörkjosen 1)	31	6.1			505
Remainder	53	3.9			1376
Skjervöy total	518	10.6	57.8	40.0	4922
place Skjervöy	386	27.6			1397
Remainder	132	3.9			3525

1) Include small adjacent rural areas

Sources for Table 1: Population registers of the three communes, Central Bureau of Statistics, undated a, b and c, 1963, 1964 and 1965.

However the effect of local migration on regrouping of population within an area does not necessarily reflect its numerical importance, but rather the degree to which the selectivity of local migration, both in terms of the characteristics of migrants and the places from, and to, which they migrate, is greater or less than that of other migratory movements. It is possible, for example, that a low volume of movement, if it all follows the same direction, such as towards a growing village, might affect the redistribution of population more than migration exchange with other areas, if the latter affected all parts of the commune equally.

When the amount of change in population due to net local migration was plotted on a scattergram against the overall change for the period 1950-1965 for each E.D. (population figures at E.D. level were not available for 1946), it was found that in two of the communes there was no correlation between the two (Nordreisa r=0.24, Kvænangen r= 0.19). In Skjervöy, on the other hand, there was a correlation of 0.93, but on closer examination this proved to be due to just four E.D.'s. These were the place Skjervöy, which had the highest net gain of local migrants, and three E.D.'s with a high net loss, including two which were becoming depopulated. When these E.D.'s were excluded there was no correlation in Skjervöy either (r= 0.33). With the exception of these four E.D.'s therefore, local migration not only proved to be of minor importance, but its volume and the direction of its effect, whether positive or negative, were unrelated to the size or direction of overall population change.

In considering changes in size of the entire population at E.D. level it is impossible to distinguish change due to migration exchange with other areas from change due to natural increase, as records are only kept at commune level. It is therefore not possible to compare local with other migration. However, for one age group, that which was aged 0-14 in 1950 and 15-29 fifteen years later, changes in the size of the group can be attributed almost entirely to migration. The difference between the change due to local migration and total change can therefore be taken to represent the net effect of migration exchange with other areas.

The lack of correlation between gain or loss by local migration and change in size of the age group is still more marked than for the population as a whole. Local migration therefore emerges neither as an alternative to migration to other areas nor as a particular feature of E.D.'s which are experiencing high levels of migration loss to other areas. The general pattern is similar to that of the population as a whole; in most E.D.'s local migration is of relatively small importance compared with other migration, but here again the same four E.D.'s stand out as exceptions.

Selection in local migration

While local migration might be of small importance for the size of the population in individual areas, selective local movement by age and sex might lead to certain groups being disproportionally affected. The question is whether selectivity operates in local migration operates in the same way in local migration as in inter-communal migration, so that it accentuates the effect of the latter on population structure. Alt-

ernately it is possible that groups which are less prone to migrate over longer distances might be more inclined to move when it does not involve leaving the area they know. If the latter is the case, local movement might modify, even counteract, some of the effects of migration to other areas on population structure.

As a rule women are more migratory than men. Table 2 shows that among some groups of local migrants, those moving to villages, the proportion of male migrants is higher than for other categories of migrants. In the case of the place Skjervöy the proportion of male local migrants exceeds their share of the total population.

Table 2. Number of males per 100 females: migrants and resident population 1950 and 1965.

	Local migrs.	Of these Subsidised 1)	Others	Out-migrs. 2) 1951-64	In-migrs. 2) 1951-64	Resident population 1950	1965
Kvænangen	76.6			78.5	71.4	109.0	111.3
Nordreisa total	77.6			77.5	71.7	110.5	115.3
Storslett	88.9			58.8	62.6	109.2	105.1
Sörkjosen	93.7			103.0	71.4	122.2	127.5
Remainder	60.6			97.0	78.9	106.6	116.0
Skjervöy total	105.5	124.6	98.4	63.3	59.8	112.0	111.1
place Skjervöy	116.8	139.5	109.6	66.1	70.2	100.5	103.6
Remainder	78.4	100.0	66.7	66.0	48.5	115.0	114.3

1) Government assisted migrants. see above p.3.
2) For subdivisions of communes 1962-mid 1965.

Sources: As Table 1 and in addition unpublished records of government assisted migration, migration notifications, Central Bureau of Statistics, undated d.

In the case of Skjervöy, a portion of the local migrants, those who have moved from exposed coastal areas with government assistance, might be expected to have a ratio of males to females comparable to that of the population as a whole. As table 2 shows, it was in fact higher, and this has influenced the ratio for the commune as a whole. But even when this group is excluded there are still more male than female migrants to the place Skjervöy. In a study in New Zealand Keown found that, when the number of migrants was plotted against distance moved, there was a marked peak for male migrants at about 20 miles (32 km.), though he does not specify the nature of their destinations within a given area (Keown, 1971, p.178). The median distance moved by migrants within the communes studied would be slightly less, though the nature of the area's topography makes meaningful measurement of distance virtually impossible. However, one might tentatively suggest that the presence of a growing village in a rural area appears to have some influence on the migration of males, either by encouraging some to move who would otherwise not have done, or by slightly reducing the number which leaves the commune, though the latter still far exceeds the number of movers within the commune.

Selection by age

Migrants to and from the communes studied come for a large part from a narrow age range, between 40% and 50% are between the ages of 15 and 24 (Nicholson, 1971, p.109). The proportion of this age group which moved within communes was also greater than the proportion of the pop-

ulation as a whole, but only slightly. It appears therefore that migrants within communes are more evenly distributed over the age range than migrants between communes. As the dates within communes are not known, there was rarely any indication in the data source, age structure cannot be examined directly. However some indication of it can be gained from the proportion of local migrants who moved as groups, generally households, as opposed to single migrants. The greater the proportion of migrant units which consisted of more than one person, the more evenly distributed across the age range would one expect the migrants to be; a migrant unit is defined as a single migrant or a group of migrants who moved together.

Table 3. Migrant units which consisted of more than one person as a percentage of all migrant units. Proportion of migrants in these groups.

	Local migrs.	Of these Subsidised	Of these Others	Out-migrs. 1962-5	In-migrs. 1962-5	Proportion of migrants
Kvænangen	24.3			10.1	25.9	58.9
Nordreisa total	15.3			15.7	20.6	37.8
Storslett	21.6					43.1
Sörkjosen	16.7					51.6
Remainder	9.1					24.5
Skjervöy	41.4	89.2	33.3	15.7	20.1	71.2
place Skjervöy	43.0	92.0	35.3			74.5
Remainder	36.1	83.3	26.0			67.8

1) n = 37

Sources: Population registers, migration notifications, records of government assisted migration.

Except in the case of Nordreisa, Table 3 supports the view that local migration is less age selective than migration over longer distances. Therefore the age structure of local migrants will be more similar to that of the resident population than that of other migrants.

In the case of Skjervöy, where the proportion of moving groups which consists of more than one person is much higher than in the other communes, the proportion has been inflated by the government assisted migrants; only 10% of the moving groups among the latter were single migrants. This can be attributed to to the nature of the subsidy schene, which is based on compensation for loss of an abandonned dwelling. However these migrants do not account for the entire difference between Skjervöy and the other communes. Another factor is the higher proportion of migrant units consisting of more than one person among migrants to the place Skjervöy than to other places; in Nordreisa there is a similar difference between the villages and the rest of the commune. This indicates, perhaps surprisingly, that migrants to growing villages are more evenly distributed over the age range than migrants to other places.

In interpreting the figures it is important to remember that the absolute numbers of local migrants are much smaller than absolute numbers of other migrants. The table does not show that families are particularly prone to move within communes, but rather that single people are even less prone to move locally than families.

Local effects on age structure

The concentration of much inter-communal migration within a narrow age range has the effect of depleting the younger adult age groups and the number of women in areas which are losing population and the opposite effect in areas gaining population. It has been shown here that local migrants are not concentrated in these age groups to the same extent asother migrants and that among migrants to villages there is a relatively high proportion of men. Furthermore, the numbers of local migrants are small and they have taken place over a long period of time. Besides, by definition, they have all been within the same area, therefore compensating movements are likely to consist of migrants from a similar age range. Therefore in most areas one would expect local migration to have had little effect on the population structure. It is only in areas with a large net gain, or net loss, that local migration has modified the age structure. Even in these cases the effect has been slight. The place Skjervöy has gained young adults, especially males, but there has also been a gain in the older age groups. The effect of local migration, therefore has been to increase the adult population as a whole, and not merely a section of it. In other E.D.'s with a net local migration gain changes have been slight in all age groups, and there has been no clear tendency of gain or loss in any of them. The position is similar in E.D.'s which have experienced net loss by local migration, in spite of their losses being greater in proportion to their populations than were the gains in most of the E.D.'s with a net gain. Local migration has thus even less effect on the structure of population in individual E.D.'s than on its size.

Direction of movement

Even if the volume of local migration is small, it might still be making a contribution to urbanisation if such migration as takes place goes from the most remote, or sparsely populated, E.D.'s to villages. The relatively high level of local migration to the place Skjervöy and the net gain of local migrants in Storslett and Sörkjosen suggest that this might be happening. However a number of rural E.D.'s are also gaining population as a result of local migration.

When gross, as opposed to net, movements are considered, a more complex pattern emerges. Individual E.D.'s have, in most cases, migration exchanges with all other parts of the commune (though due to the small numbers, not every E.D.). As with other migratory movements, almost all E.D.'s have both outward and inward movement.

The lowest out-migration, both absolutely and relatively, is from the place Skjervöy. This accords with the view that migration is for a large part upwards in the urban hierachy, or at least not downwards. However in the case of the other two villages such a tendency is not apparent. If the pattern of movement is indeed hierachical, then there appears to be a lower limit to the size of settlement at which it begins to operate. If this is the case, then in this part of Norway, though not necessarily elsewhere, the lower population size of such settlements seems to lie between 500 and 1400.

Although movements take place both in and out of the majority of E.D.'s, there is a sizeable number where the direction of inward movements does not correspond to that of outward movements. Neither the range of population size nor the number of migrants differs from those in E.D.'s where migration directions do correspond. The only apparent difference between the two groups of E.D.'s is that the former are situated on islands, and the latter, for the most part, on the mainland. As the

E.D.'s being depopulated are located within the same area, one might expect that this non-reciprocated movement was part of a chain of movements from the remotest to steadily less remote places. In a few instances this does indeed appear to be happening. Over half of the people who left one of the settlements being depopulated on the outer coast moved to the nearby fishing village of Årviksand, all local out-migration from the latter place went to the place Skjervöy. There is a further example of this pattern of movement in another part of the same island. However in the majority of E.D.'s with unreciprocated movements this pattern is not found. There is rather, a form of circulation between E.D.'s, but one in which no pattern or regularities can be discerned. Migration from the remainder of the areas being depopulated, which form a very small proportion of the total, especially in population, goes either to nearby places from which migration to the place Skjervöy is very modest, to other places in the commune, or direct to the place Skjervöy itself. In the case of one of the largest places to be depopulated, Meiland, the nearest neighbouring place was the place Skjervöy. Though the majority of migrants settled there, some did not, and one can speculate whether the direction of movement might not have been different, had the place Skjervöy been located further from Meiland.

Within Skjervöy there is an indication of a division of E.D.'s into a group which sends local migrants predominantly to the place Skjervöy and another group from which the majority of migrants move to other places. This might indicate that the inhabitants of some areas perceive the place Skjervöy as an intervening opportunity, but others do not. However the distinction between the two groups of E.D.'s is not clear enough to be conclusive. There does, however seem to be a slight tendency for E.D.'s with a greater than average loss by migration to the place Skjervöy to be those with the greatest proportional population decline.

In the case of the two small agglomerations in Nordreisa, the pattern is less clear. Both places receive migrants from all E.D.'s, but, with one exception, all E.D.'s, including both villages, have also lost migrants to the remainder of the commune. There was also some exchange between the villages, but it was quite modest. In each case there was just one E.D. which lost most of its local out-migrants to one of the villages, a coastal E.D. to Sörkjosen and one of its immediately neighbouring E.D.'s to Storslett.

This latter feature has a parallel in Skjervöy, where too an immediately adjacent E.D. has lost out-migrants predominantly to the place Skjervöy. In the latter case access to the place Skjervöy was not easy, but an improvement was in prospect and has since materialised. The closing of the school and the transfer of children to the school in the place Skjervöy was also expected. However, other E.D.'s adjacent to villages possessed one or both of these characteristics, but did not experience high out-migration to the village. One such E.D., adjacent to the place Skjervöy, though on a different island, itself experienced growth due to local migration and lost very few migrants to the place Skjervöy. Communications between the two places were not good at the time and commuting was not possible, therefore the net gain from local migration must be considered to have happened independently of, or even in spite of, growth of the place Skjervöy.

Local migration systems

10

Differences in propensity to migrate to the local village are also found among E.D.'s furthest from the villages. Even allowing for the diffic-

ulties of obtaining a realistic measure of distance in island and mountainous areas, there is no clear relationship between distance and the propensity to migrate to a village, as opposed to any other part of the commune.

It is reasonable to ask whether within a relatively small area the effects of distance are important. The commune in Norway is, or was until recently, by far the most important unit of local government. As a result it has had a strong consciousness of identity, and the inhabitants of the individual parts are accustomed to having contact with and awareness of all the others, whether in cooperation or conflict. The importance of the unit also means that virtually all the inhabitants have occasion to visit offices of the communal administration and therefore become acquainted with the places in which they are located. Thus, unlike more distant potential migration destinations, possible destinations within the commune, and their reputations, are well known to virtually everyone.

In migration literature, size of migration streams has commonly been linked to the amount of contact between places (perhaps most notably by Dahl, 1957, see also Olsson, 1965). However the existence of large migration flows must be due to positive feedback which results from these contacts. But feedback can also be negative. It is perhaps at the local level that the importance of the latter can be most easily discerned, as it is here that local prejudices are clearly apparent. The inhabitants have well established opinions about their neighbours, such as that expressed by a Newfoundland migrant about a settlement he did not migrate to, he called it a "savage hollow". (Iverson & Matthews, 1966, p.12). Similarly, they might be deterred from moving to a place by the attitude they expect its inhabitants to have towards them (Mook & Aubert, 1970, p.26).

Opinions about the place Skjervöy are less extreme, but there exist certain antagonisms towards it on the part of people in the smaller places as it is perceived of getting more than its fair share of the available resources. Therefore some people are unlikely to even contemplate moving to their local village. To them, a place in another district where they already know someone might be considered as a migration destination instead.

The importance of kin, peers, friends or other people from the same place who have already moved in encouraging and assisting later migrants has been documented in a number of studies (e.g. Pourcher, 1964, pp. 177, 193, Wallander, 1948, pp.230-231) and a few have considered the role of negative feedback (Taylor 1974, pp.18-19, In t'Veld-Langeveld, 1957, p.140). Some potential migrants will have friends, relatives or former neighbours elsewhere in the same commune, some of whom might have moved on marriage. Over the generations links grow up between pairs of places which are stronger than those with other places (e.g. Perry, 1969, p.131), indeed may be regarded almost as an alliance which might be slightly antagonistic to some other localities. Any movements which contribute to the trend towards urbanisation take place within this context.

People have been moving to towns for decades, and in particular since the latter part of the nineteenth century. It is relatively recently that local villages have begun to grow, and in absolute terms their growth is still less than that of the larger towns, therefore the kinship and friendship networks which resulted from earlier migrations will also be less well developed. Put another way, migrants moving to

towns are as likely, perhaps even more likely, to know a relative or friend who lives in a large, more distant town than one who lives in a smaller place which lies much nearer.

The relationship of intra-commune to inter-commune migration

According to theories of chain migration, migration from a rural area to its local village is the first of a chain of moves, each one proceeding a stage further up the hierachy. Therefore the next stage after movement to the local village , will be movement from that village to the large town in the hinterland of which it lies, on the Ravenstein model.

In the area under consid eration here, migration within communes is far smaller in volume than migration exchange with other communes, and the losses due to the latter from all E.D.'s leave no doubt that, even though the villages send and receive more migrants in relation to their populations, migration out of the communes is from all areas, and not only the villages.

If one compares the migrants from the villages and the remainder of the communes according to their origins, it becomes apparent that a relatively large proportion of emigrants from the former are not people from the district moving up the urban hierachy, but immigrants leaving the area again. The high level of migration from villages can therefore be ascribed to their higher turnover of career migrants, as compared with rural areas (c.f. Pourcher, 1964, pp.81-82). In this

Table 4. Proportions of migrant groups born outside the respective communes.

		Immigr. since 1946, resident 1965	Emigrants 1962-mid 1965
Kvænangen:	Kjækan	17.3	63.9
	Remainder	8.0	21.3
Nordreisa	Storslett	19.9	43.7
	Sörkjosen	18.6	37.3
	Remainder	9.5	29.6
Skjervöy	place Skjervöy	21.7	61.1
	Remainder	9.9	26.2

Sources: Population registers, migration notifications.

respect the villages, especially the place Skjervöy show similarities in the composition of both resident population and emigrants with an area of Kvænangen where a power station was under construction, and where, consequently, there was a temporary labour force.

A result of the growth of urbanised settlement, therefore, appears to be the creation new opportunities for members of occupational groups who move from one place to another in the course of their careers. Comparison of Table 4 and Table 1 (above p.4) shows that, in the case of the place Skjervöy, immigrants from other communes between 1946 and 1965 comprised only a slightly smaller proportion of the population than local migrants. In the case of the two villages in Nordreisa, their share of the resident population is twice as great. Thus an important element in the growth of villages and small towns in rural areas is immigration from other areas. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that a policy to encourage such growth might result in increased mobility, possibly over long distances, without reducing immigration to traditional migration destinations.

Notes

This paper is based on a longer study which is to be published in Norwegian.

1) The Norwegian census definition of urban (tettsted) is a settlement with at least 200 inhabitants, in which no dwelling is more than 50 meters from another and in which at least 75% of the occupationally active population is engaged in industries other than agriculture.

2) According to the boundaries as they were prior to 1.1.1965.

References

Berg, P.O. (1965), Ringvirkninger av ny storindustri,(Oslo: D.U.F.).
Central Bureau of Statistics (undated a), Population Census 1960, commune volume, Skjervöy (Oslo)
(undated b), ,, , Nordreisa (Oslo).
(undated c), ,, , Kvænangen (Oslo).
(undated d), Population Census 1950, maskintabell 201, (Oslo).
(1963), Folkemengden i herreder og byer 1962 (Oslo).
(1964), ,, 1963 (Oslo).
(1965), ,, 1964 (Oslo).
(1973), Folke- og boligtelling 1970, commune volume Nordreisa (Oslo).
Harvey, M.E. & J.B. Riddell (1975), Development, urbanisation and migration: a test of the hypothesis in the Third World, in Kosinski & Prother (eds.), People on the move, (London: Methuen), pp.51-65.
Dahl, S. (1957), The contacts of Västerås with the rest of Sweden, in Migration in Sweden, Lund Studies in Geography B 13, (Lund: Gleerup), pp.206-243.
Hägerstrand, T. (1957), Migration and Area, in Migration in Sweden, op.cit., pp. 27-158.
Jones, H.R. (1974), Newtown. A case study of migration to a growth point in Mid-Wales. University of Dundee, Dept. of Geography, Occasional Paper 2.
Keown, P.C. (1971), The Career Cycle and the Stepwise migration Process, NewZealand Geographer, 27, pp.175-184.
Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet (1967), St.meld. nr 87 (1966-1967) Om distriktsplanlegging (Oslo)
,, (1973), St.meld. nr 108 (1972-73) Om landsdelsplan for Nord-Norge (Oslo).
Miljöverndepartementet (1972), Om landsdelsplan for Nord-Norge (Oslo)
Mook, R. & V. Aubert (1970), Flyttemönstret og lokalsamfunnets struktur. En undersökelse i Karasjok. Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning, pp.13-31.
Myklebost, H. (1960), Norges tettbygde steder (Oslo: Universitetsforlag).
Myklebost, H. (1974), Bosetningsutviklingen i Norge, Plan og Arbeid 4, pp.145-154.
Nicholson, B. (1971), Tilbakeflytting til et utkantdistrikt, Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning bind 12 nr 2 (Oslo), pp.99-122.
Perry, P.J. (1969), Working class isolation and mobility in rural Dorset, 1837-1936, T.I.B.G. 46, pp.121-139.
Pitie, J. (1957), Essai de representation graphique d'exode rural dans le cadre d'une commune, Norois, pp.487-496.
Pourcher, G. (1964), Le peuplement de Paris (Paris: P.U.F.).
Ravenstein, E.G. (1885), The Laws of Migration, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII, pp.167-227.
Taylor, R. (1974), Migration and the residual community. Paper presented at the Seminar on Marginal Regions, University of Aberdeen, 24-25 Sept.